

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
ATTORNEY STAFFING WORKGROUP
AUGUST 8, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

I. GENERAL

On Tuesday, August 8, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Attorney Staffing Workgroup held its second Official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Antonia Agerbek, County Co-Leader (DDA, Sonoma County)
- ☒ Linda Anisman (Director\DDA, Inyo County)
- ☐ Janet Ballou (ChildSupport Attorney, CCSAS)
- ☒ Janice Doi (Supervising DDA, Santa Clara County)
- ☒ Mike Farrell, DCSS Co-Leader (Program Improvement Manager, DCSS)
- ☒ Hossein Moftakhar, DCSS Analyst (Statistical Analyst, DCSS)
- ☒ Julie S. Paik (Facilitator, Los Angeles County)
- ☒ Bruce Petterson (Orange County)
- ☒ Sherri Quadri (San Bernardino – Judicial Council)

Ex officio:

- ☒ Jim Hennessey, Facilitator (PSI)
- ☒ Barb Saunders (OCSE)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Address corrections to the Julie S. Paik, who will send corrected minutes to the Workgroup.

Jim passed out and reviewed a document, **Comments to Workgroups**, attached hereto, regarding the format of the subcommittees and continuation of the subcommittees once the short-term projects are completed. Jim stressed the importance of taking notes. **Julie agreed to do so with the understanding that she would not have to do it again, to which the group concurred.**

II. REVIEW AND DISCUSS SURVEYS AND HOSSEIN'S EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hossein distributed the results of the data from the phone surveys, conducted by Bruce, Janice and Linda. Seventeen of the eighteen counties surveyed provided complete data for the surveys. Please see documents entitled, **Results of Survey of Counties on Attorney Staffing Ratio and State of California Department of Child Support Services Child Support Audit System (CSAS)**.

On the survey, the calculation for cases per attorney is the number of all attorneys, including administrative managers, divided by the number of cases from the CSAS system. However, the

calculation for the average number of cases taken to court/week is based on the number of DDA's with cases, not including administrative managers.

The subcommittee agreed that the data provided a good snapshot of how different counties hire and utilize its attorneys.

III. REVIEW AND DISCUSS STAFFING RATIO INFORMATION

Antonia passed out some data regarding each county's caseload, total staff, caseworker and attorney staff and caseworker and attorney workload

IV. GUEST SPEAKER RE: METHODOLOGY: JIM HENNESSEY AND LINDA'S SUMMARY OF WASHINGTON AND COLORADO STAFFING STANDARDS

A. Jim's report - Methodology

Jim passed out a document, **Staffing Work Group**, to start his discussion. He outlined our long and short-term goals and discussed different types of methodologies to gather and cull data to achieve these goals. He also discussed that Methodologies are based on ideal data and information, which is not feasible for our group.

He stated that the surveys were a good place to start but more data needed to be collected. He suggested incorporating data from the 14.10 reports. He stated that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to come up with actual ratios for attorney staffing. However, he stressed the importance of creating a methodology, listing different variables and standards, to allow for future studies to determine appropriate attorney ratios.

The subcommittee discussed its relationship to the caseworker subcommittee. The legislation requests casework ratios, not attorney ratios, so it is important to get data and input from the caseworkers committee to see how the two groups interact. What are best practices for attorneys/case workers? How can we incorporate them into our results? Also, the attorney does not usually get involved in the case unless the case cannot be resolved.

B. Linda's report on Washington and Colorado ratios

The Washington report is not pertinent to our needs as the state follows an administrative model with cases being sent to a prosecuting attorney's office. This report is not comparable.

The Colorado report is a detailed study but no attorneys are involved in the system. Also, there are no definitions of each job title so it is impossible to ascertain who does what work. The ratio

of technician to caseload is 1:581 for establishment in all cases and 1:378 in enforcement in welfare cases.

Barbara mentioned that she called many states to get some data regarding attorney ratios. Of the six states she called, none of them kept such data.

Results that are to be reported to the Steering Committee

Based on the presentation, the group determined the following primary tasks:

1. Identify variables that go into the decision-making process of establishing attorney ratios.
 - A. Direct versus constructive supervision;
 - B. What attorneys must do/can do;
 - C. Difficulty of the cases;
 - D. Processes used by attorneys;
 - E. Demographics, such as number of non-marital births, poverty rate;
 - F. Automation/business process choices/case tracking;
 - G. Local court policies;
 - H. Court time available;
 - I. Caseworker resources to identify cases needing legal referrals;
 - J. Established performance goals; and
 - K. Increased administrative processes.
2. Continue with the factfinding mission. What does the data show? What more do we need?
3. Set up a model, plan and/or parameters to get to the right ratios and recommend approach.
4. **Query:** What role will the administrative process play in the future? How soon will this happen? How do we deal with this? What assumptions should we make about it?
5. **Query:** What are the expectations of the workgroup for the public hearings?

REVIEW MINUTES FROM CASEWORKER STAFFING AND NON-CAMP ENFORCEMENT WORKGROUPS

Mike distributed materials from the caseworker subcommittee, to be reviewed for the next meeting.

The subcommittee discussed different types of obligors and best practices to enforce against them. Other issues to be considered re obligors include the unemployed and/or self-employed obligor, the Native American population and private resources in each county to assist NCPs.

VI. REVIEW AND DISCUSS BEST PRACTICES INFORMATION

This was tabled for the next meeting.

VII. ACTIONS ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

1. Polish comparative results data on counties surveyed - Hossein
2. Bring attorneys, paralegal job classes - all
3. Check data that has already been collected – Mike
4. Bring Bureau of Family Support job descriptions - Mike
5. Bring Price Waterhouse report - Bruce
6. Bring spreadsheets from 5 largest states re attorneys and performance ratios - Barb
7. Invite Curt Child to next meeting - Jim
8. Send comments to Hosseing re survey results - all
9. Review Methodologies - all
10. Get Strateic Plan - Jim

VIII. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

1. Brainstorm more variables
2. Duties and roles of attorneys (using uniformity issues list, legal staff duty lists)
3. Review of Polished Survey
4. Discuss Methodologies